2.3

THE COURT: At the outset, Mr. Brafman, I wanted you to know, which I think you do, I've arranged for a Turkish interpreter.

Two questions; first, is that needed, and second, I would ask Mr. Zarrab if he's able to understand the proceedings with the help of that interpreter.

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, your Honor. First, your Honor, thank you. Good morning. It's always a privilege to appear here.

We appreciate that you have requested an interpreter. We are able to communicate with our client in English, but he does prefer to use an interpreter for this proceeding, and we're pleased that he is available for us. We've had an opportunity to speak with our client at length this morning thanks to the courtesy of the Marshals, and we are prepared to proceed.

THE COURT: For the proceeding, we'll have simultaneous translation, not backup?

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Zarrab, you are able to understand these proceedings with the help of the interpreter?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: Great.

I just wanted to make mention at the outset of something that I think the parties should be aware of. That

is, that I personally have been in Istanbul on one occasion.

And incidentally, on that occasion, I found Istanbul and its people to be warm, welcoming, and beautiful. Indeed, I found it to be a fantastic city.

The occasion was May of 2014, and I was one of five Americans, including three prominent constitutional law professors, the Vermont Attorney General, and myself, among 20 speakers in total to participate in an International Legal Symposium for lawyers, law students, academics, and judges about the rule of law.

The symposium was cosponsored by the United Nations

Local Compact and a leading Istanbul law firm, formerly an

affiliate of DLA Piper. The name of that law firm is

YükselKarkinKüçük. I will give you the spelling if you need

it.

The two-day program included the panel that I moderated, which was entitled Independent and Effective Judiciary. My copanelists were Gabriela Knaul of Brazil. She is a United Nations special reporter. Also, Professor Isil Karakas of Turkey. She's with the European Court of Human Rights. Professor Lucian Mihai is the Former President of the Constitutional Court of Romania. And finally, Judge Thomas Guddat of Germany.

I mention this as a matter of disclosure. My participation in this panel does not impact my ability to

preside over this case fairly and impartially, and to ensure
that Mr. Zarrab, who is presumed to be innocent, as you all
know, receives a fair and impartial hearing and eventual trial.
I'm distributing to counsel a copy of the outline I used for my
remarks at the symposium.

The business at hand, Mr. Brafman, I do not believe there has been an arraignment yet in this matter. I would ask first if you and Mr. Zarrab have received and reviewed the superceding indictment in this case.

MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, we have, and we have had an opportunity -- my partner, Mr. Agnifilo, has been able to review it. I have discussed it with Mr. Zarrab and waive a reading, and he's prepared to enter a plea of not guilty to the charges.

THE COURT: Fine. Thank you.

2.3

MR. BRAFMAN: Might I add, your Honor, that with all modesty, you have proven me correct. I was familiar with your Honor's remarks and appearance in Istanbul because, in our thoroughness, we try and follow everything that everyone does. And I think you know the great — so I said that the first thing the Judge is going to do is raise the fact that he participated in the panel, so I'm glad that you proved me correct.

You understand, I think, my great respect for this Court, and my experience here has allowed me to conclude that

you are indeed a fair and impartial judge, so I appreciate your giving us this. We have seen nothing to date which would suggest that you could not participate in any way, and obviously, we appreciate the fact that you brought it to our attention.

THE COURT: Thank you. My experience in the civil cases that we've had is that, generally speaking, you're one step ahead of me, and so you have proved me correct in that regard.

MR. BRAFMAN: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Having entered this not guilty plea, have you, Mr. Brafman, and the government had a chance to meet and confer as to next steps and timing in this matter?

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes. Your Honor, the government has been very gracious in that regard. We are not seeking to have a detention hearing today. We would like to adjourn that for a date that would be convenient to the Court and the government. We are hopeful that we might be able to reach a consent on that issue, and if we are not able to, we would then notify the Court for scheduling purposes so that your Honor could set a detention hearing schedule at the Court's convenience, and we would then seek to advise the Court in writing of what our proposal is so that you have an opportunity to review everything in advance.

The government this morning informed us that they are

going to expedite discovery. As you can imagine, it involves voluminous materials, but they have agreed to provide us in a format that hopefully we can use as expeditiously as possible.

We talked, I think, about possibly 30 days to get that done, or at least begin the process, and if we want to have the detention hearing before that, which we will, obviously, we will, of course, notify the Court.

THE COURT: I would be happy to. If you meet and confer and work things out, so much the better. If not, as and when the time comes, I'll set a schedule for any submissions you might want to make in advance of a hearing or conference.

MR. KAMARAJU: Yes, your Honor. Just to give the Court some context with respect to the discovery. It does involve several categories, primarily email documents, bank records, telephone records, and the like. We're talking about hundreds of thousands of pages here, and we've discussed with defense counsel the best manner in which to provide it to them. We would ask the Court to set 30 days. We'll obviously work with defense counsel to try to get it to them as quickly as possible.

THE COURT: Did you mean 30 days to come back here?

MR. KAMARAJU: I meant 30 days for us to essentially

complete the discovery that we have now, and maybe we can set a

conference date after that.

THE COURT: Mr. Brafman, is that okay with you?

1 MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, your Honor.

2.3

THE COURT: We can go off the record and talk about when you think the two of you might want to come back. I'd like to set a date, and we can always change it if you're not ready.

MR. KAMARAJU: Absolutely, your Honor.

MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, just so we're clear, sir, we're going to agree on a date to come back to talk discovery and motions, but if we want to do a detention hearing well in advance, we'll simply convey it to the Court's deputy and see if we can expedite that process?

THE COURT: Exactly.

(Discussion off the record)

MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, subject to the Court's availability, we have agreed on the date of June 16th to come back to indicate to the Court hopefully where we are up to, and then, if appropriate, set a motion schedule with the understanding that, with respect to detention, we anticipate moving much more quickly and asking for a date fairly soon.

THE COURT: Let's see if that works. That does work. How about 11:00 a.m. on June 16th?

MR. KAMARAJU: That's fine for the government, your Honor.

MR. BRAFMAN: That's fine, Judge.

THE COURT: I think it's pretty clear, but just to put

a fine point on it, June 16, 2016 at 11:00 a.m. That would be a status conference for the case, understanding that there may be an earlier proceeding with respect to detention.

Is there an issue of speedy trial?

MR. BRAFMAN: No. We're going to consent to the adjournment up through June 16th, your Honor.

MR. KAMARAJU: Your Honor, the government would obviously seek to exclude time based on the production of discovery and to give defense counsel an opportunity to review it.

THE COURT: I'm going find under 18 United States

Code, Section 3161 that the request for adjournment joined in

by both sides is appropriate and warrants exclusion of the

adjourned time from speedy trial calculations.

I further find that the exclusion is designed to prevent any possible miscarriage of justice, to facilitate these proceedings, including the discovery process, and to guarantee effective representation of and preparation by counsel for both parties.

Thus, the need for exclusion and the ends of justice outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial pursuant to 18 United States Code, Section 3161(h)(7)(A) and (b). That adjourn date is without prejudice, as we've said, to parties coming back earlier to discuss the issue of detention or any other issue that they may wish to